

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Applicant has amended the claims to more distinctly point out features of the invention. Claims 5 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Sakasegawa (US Pat 6,023,130).

Sakasegawa is directed to a plasma display substrate, and teaches a rear plate and a plurality of partitions for forming display cells between every two adjacent partitions on one of the surfaces of the rear plate. However, Sakasegawa does not teach or suggest ‘a bulb emitting light, being formed of a transparent material, and having a plurality of semicircular patterns formed on a surface of the bulb due to an alignment of grooves having a predetermined depth formed on a surface of the bulb’, as required by amended claim 1, nor does Sakasegawa teach or suggest ‘a bulb emitting light, being formed of a transparent material, and having a plurality of v-shaped patterns formed on a surface of the bulb due to an alignment of a plurality of grooves having a predetermined depth’, as required by amended claim 9. That is, although Fig. 2A of Sakasegawa shows display cells having some sort of polygonal cross-section, the shape of the cross-section is not semicircular or v-shaped, as required by amended claims 1 and 9, respectively. Therefore, Sakasegawa does not teach all the claimed elements of amended claim 1 or 9, as required for a rejection under 35 USC 102. Thus, amended independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable over the cited reference.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-18 have been allowed by the Examiner.

Allowability of Claims

Because amended independent claims 1 and 9 are distinguishable over the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that the §102 rejections should be withdrawn. Amended claims 2-4 and 6-8 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1,

and also because they each recite independently patentable features not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Amended claims 10-12 and 14 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 9, and also because they each recite independently patentable features not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Claims 15-18 have been allowed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the claim rejections, and issue a notice of allowance. No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein, and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have expressly argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA

Date: February 1, 2006

By:



Craig W. Schmoyer
Registration No. 51,007
Attorney for Applicant

For: George W. Luckhardt
Registration No.: 50,519
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884

801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211